

This Page Is Inserted by IFW Operations
and is not a part of the Official Record

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images may include (but are not limited to):

- BLACK BORDERS
- TEXT CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES
- FADED TEXT
- ILLEGIBLE TEXT
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES
- COLORED PHOTOS
- BLACK OR VERY BLACK AND WHITE DARK PHOTOS
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning documents *will not* correct images,
please do not report the images to the
Image Problem Mailbox.

PPA



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/725,717	11/30/2000	Dale W. Malik	BS00-168	1249

28970 7590 07/22/2004

SHAW PITTMAN
IP GROUP
1650 TYSONS BOULEVARD
SUITE 1300
MCLEAN, VA 22102

EXAMINER

VU, THONG H

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2142

DATE MAILED: 07/22/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<p align="center">Office Action Summary</p>	<p>Application No.</p> <p>09/725,717</p>	<p>Applicant(s)</p> <p>MALIK, DALE W.</p>	
	<p>Examiner</p> <p>Thong H Vu</p>	<p>Art Unit</p> <p>2142</p>	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
 - If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
 - Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 June 2004.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-28 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

1. Claims 1-28 are pending.
2. Claims 1,8,18,21 and 26 have been amended. The Final Action is appropriate.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Melet et al [Melet 6,615,238 B1] in view of Nevarez et al [Nevarez 6,189,103 B1].
4. As per claim 1, Melet discloses a method of automatically checking for an incorrect e-mail address in an outgoing e-mail communication, comprising the steps of:

(b) checking if a domain name of the e-mail address associated with the intend recipient of the out going e-mail communication is included in the list of domain names in the memory [Melet, if the destination address is an e-mail address, the e-mail address is checked for an invalid domain name, col 11 lines 57-67]; and

(c) generating a prompt for a user to confirm an e-mail address associated with the intend recipient of the out going e-mail communication if the domain name is not included in the list provided in the e-mail [Melet, If the e-mail address is determined to be invalid, then the remote interrogation processing system will transmit back to the Applet a CurrentPage value of 3, indicating that the second revolution should be

Art Unit: 2142

displayed again to the user, modified to include a message instructing the user to enter a new destination, col 11 lines 57-col 12 lines 5].

Melet also discloses a second database stores information associated with the sponsor computers 540 [Melet, col 6 lines 13-26, Fig 5]. However Melet does not detail

(a) storing a list of domain names in a memory;

It was well-known in the Internet art that a web server connected to a DNS (Domain Name server) and Web server programs or servlets could provide services such as sending email, translating IP address into Domain names [see Nevarez reference, col 1 lines 27-38]; or DNS translates the name into IP address by looking up the domain name in a database [see Glenn reference, col 1 lines 22-30]; or storing domain name in a database [Woundy reference, col 6 lines 25-35]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the a list of domain names in a memory or domain name database or a DNS connected to Web server as taught by Nevarez into Melet's apparatus in order to utilize the second database. Doing so would provide a dynamic and simple process to verify the Domain name on Internet.

5. Claims 21,26 contain the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 1.

Therefore, claims 21,26 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

6. As per claim 2, Melet-Nevarez disclose extracting a domain name from each e-mail address provided in the outgoing e-mail communication, wherein the e-mail

Art Unit: 2142

communication is transmitted after checking each extracted domain name in the list of domain names, and confirming each e-mail address for which the extracted domain name is not included in the list of domain names [Melet, checked for an invalid domain name, col 11 lines 57-col 12 lines 5].

7. As per claim 3, Melet-Nevarez disclose the domain names, in the list of domain names stored in the memory are extracted from senders' e-mail addresses from incoming e-mail communications [Melet, select categories, col 7 lines 4-17].

8. As per claim 4, Melet-Nevarez disclose receiving a corrected e-mail address from the user in response to the prompt; and repeating the steps of checking a corrected domain name and generating a prompt if the corrected domain name is not included in the list of domain names, until the user either confirms that the domain name provided in the e-mail address is correct or provides a domain name that is in the list of domain names [Melet, interactive dialog box with optional menu, col 8 lines 30-50].

9. As per claim 5, Melet-Nevarez disclose the outgoing e-mail communication is intercepted in an e-mail server to check the domain name in the e-mail address prior to transmission [Melet, checked for an invalid domain name, col 11 lines 57-65].

Art Unit: 2142

10. As per claim 6, Melet-Nevarez disclose the prompt is an e-mail message from the e-mail server to the user [Melet, system send a prompt to the selected sponsor, col 13 lines 59-67].

11. As per claim 7, Melet-Nevarez disclose the prompt is a network message to the user [Melet, system send a prompt to the selected sponseor, col 13 lines 59-67].

12. As per claim 22, Melet-Nevarez disclose the e-mail addresses in the list of e-mail addresses stored in the memory are senders' e-mail addresses extracted from incoming e-mail communications [Melet, email, col 8 lines 30-40; col 11 lines 37-49; col 12 lines 37-50].

13. As per claim 23, Melet-Nevarez disclose storing tally information (i.e.: frequency tally tracks how often a user received email from a certain address) in the memory to tally the frequency by which the e-mail addresses are extracted from incoming e-mail communications [Melet, email, col 8 lines 30-40; col 11 lines 37-49; col 12 lines 37-50].

14. As per claim 24, Melet-Nevarez disclose deleting e-mail addresses from the memory that are not frequently extracted from incoming e-mail communications according to respective tally information as inherent feature of email database..

15. As per claim 25, Melet-Nevarez disclose the memory is in an e-mail address directory in a client computer system as a design choice [Melet, email address sopecified by the user, col 13 lines 3-8].

16. As per claim 27, Melet-Nevarez disclose the memory is included in an e-mail address directory [Melet, email address specified by the sponsor, col 13 lines 9-21].

17. As per claim 28, Melet-Nevarez disclose the e-mail address directory additionally stores user-specified e-mail addresses [Melet, the specified email address and tracking processing in database, col 13 lines 39-47].

18. As per claim 8, Melet-Nevarez disclose a method of automatically checking for misspelled e-mail addresses in out going e-mail communications prior to transmission by an e-mail communications server

extracting domain names in senders' e-mail address from e-mail communications incoming to the email communications server [Nevarez, translating IP address into Domain names, col 1 lines 27-38];

storing extracted domain names in a domain name database [Melet, a second database, col 6 lines 13-26, Fig 5];

receiving outgoing email communications from a client computer connected to the email communication server through a local network [Melet, destination address of email, col 11 lines 57-67];

searching the domain name database for domain names spelled similarly to the domain name in email address associated with the intend recipient of the out going e-mail communication provided in the outgoing email communications [Melet, indicating a second revolution should be displayed again to user modified, col 11 lines 57-67]; and

generating an error prompt upon detecting that a domain name in an email address provided in an outgoing email communication is misspelled [Melet, a message instructing the user to enter a new destination or select a corrected domain name, col 11 lines 57-67].

19. Claim 18 contains the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 8. Therefore, claims 18 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 8.

20. As per claim 9, Melet-Nevarez disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by checking each alpha numeric character comprised in the extracted domain name with the alpha-numeric characters comprised in the domain names in the database, and detecting when there is at least one but no more than a maximum number of discrepancies between a domain name in the domain name database and the extracted domain name as inherent feature of database with search engine [Melet, search engine, col 2 line 58-col 3 line 3; database, col 6 lines 13-27].

21. As per claim 10, Melet-Nevarez disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by removing an alpha numeric character from the extracted domain

Art Unit: 2142

name and searching the domain name database for a domain name consisting of at least each of the remaining alpha numeric characters in the extracted domain name [Melet, search engine, col 2 line 58-col 3 line 3; database, col 6 lines 13-27].

22. As per claim 11, Melet-Nevarez disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by comparing the extracted domain name with reference domain names stored in the domain name database according to predetermined spelling grammar algorithms [Melet, search engine, col 2 line 58-col 3 line 3; database, col 6 lines 13-27].

23. As per claim 12, Melet-Nevarez disclose the error prompt is an e-mail message from the e-mail server to the client computer transmitting the e-mail communication [Melet, system send a prompt to the selected sponsor, col 13 lines 59-67].

24. As per claim 13, Melet-Nevarez disclose the error prompt is a network message from the e-mail server to the client computer transmitting the e-mail communication [Melet, system send a prompt to the selected sponsor, col 13 lines 59-67].

25. As per claim 14, Melet-Nevarez disclose determining whether extracted domain names are already stored in the domain name database, whereby only a single copy of an extracted domain name is stored in the domain name database [Melet, a second database, col 6 lines 13-26, Fig 5].

26. As per claim 15, Melet-Nevarez disclose storing tally information in the domain name database to tally the frequency in which domain names in the domain name database are extracted from incoming e-mail communications [Melet, a second database, col 6 lines 13-26, Fig 5].

27. As per claim 16, Melet-Nevarez disclose deleting domain names from the domain name database that are not frequently extracted from incoming e-mail communications according to respective tally information [Melet, a second database, col 6 lines 13-26, Fig 5].

28. As per claim 17, Melet-Nevarez disclose the tally information for each domain name in the domain name database includes the calendar date in which the domain name was most recently extracted [Melet, a second database, col 6 lines 13-26, Fig 5].

29. As per claim 19, Melet-Nevarez disclose (d) an internal network communications interface for receiving outgoing e mail communications to be transmitted from client computers and sending incoming e-mail communications to client computers, wherein the e-mail checker generates an error prompt when detecting a misspelled domain name, which is transmitted from the internal network (i.e.:LAN) communications interface to the client computer requesting transmission of the corresponding outgoing

e-mail communication [Melet, a message instructing the user to enter a new destination or select a corrected domain name, col 11 lines 57-67].

30. As per claim 20, Melet-Nevarez disclose (e) an external network communications interface for receiving incoming e-mail communications from an external network and sending outgoing e-mail communications transmitted from client computer connected to the internal network, wherein outgoing e-mail communications are transmitted from the external network communications interface to the external network (i.e.: Internet) after the checker confirms e-mail address spelling in the outgoing e-mail communications [Melet, a message instructing the user to enter a new destination or select a corrected domain name, col 11 lines 57-67].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

31. Claims 1-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103 as being unpatentable over Bliss et al [Bliss 6,654,789 B1] in view of Glenn et al [Glenn 5,907,677].

32. As per claim 1, Bliss discloses a method of automatically checking for an incorrect e-mail address in an outgoing e-mail communication, comprising the steps of:

Art Unit: 2142

(b) checking if a domain name of the e-mail address associated with the intend recipient of the out going e-mail communication is included in the list of domain names in the memory [Bliss, if the preferred address is not known by the system, a heuristic table is consulted. This table contains a list of unrecognized queries and the likely corrections. The table is generated by creating a list of common misspellings to commonly used domain names or changes to commonly used domain names. For example, if it is determined that a common misspelling of the domain name freshaddress.com is freshadress.com, then the table will refer to freshaddress.com for all appearances of freshadress.com. Similarly, if the provider of freshaddress.com changes all e-mail addresses to freshaddressinc.com, then the table would match those two addresses. If an entry is found in the table, the visitor is notified of his possible error and the suggested correction. The system may then prompt the visitor to perform a corrected query; col 5 lines 24-39]; and

(c) generating a prompt (i.e.: notify) for a user to confirm an e-mail address associated with the intend recipient of the out going e-mail communication if the domain name is not included in the list provided in the e-mail [Bliss, the visitor is notified of his possible error and the suggested correction. The system may then prompt the visitor to perform a corrected query; col 5 lines 24-39].

Bliss also discloses a database stores information [Bliss, database, col 5 lines 40-54]. However Bliss does not detail

(a) storing a list of domain names in a memory;

It was well-known in the Internet art that a web server connected to a DNS (Domain Name server) translates the name into IP address by looking up the domain name in a database [Glenn reference, col 1 lines 22-30]; or storing domain name in a database [Woundy reference, col 6 lines 25-35]

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the a list of domain names in a memory or domain name database or a DNS connected to Web server as taught by Glenn into Bliss's apparatus in order to utilize the second database. Doing so would provide a dynamic and simple process to verify the Domain name on Internet.

33. Claims 21,26 contain the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 1. Therefore, claims 21,26 are rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 1.

34. As per claim 2, Bliss-Glenn disclose extracting a domain name from each e-mail address provided in the outgoing e-mail communication, wherein the e-mail communication is transmitted after checking each extracted domain name in the list of domain names, and confirming each e-mail address for which the extracted domain name is not included in the list of domain names as inherent feature of search database [Bliss, search database 45, Fig 1][see Stanbach Jr. reference].

35. As per claim 3, Bliss-Glenn disclose the domain names, in the list of domain names stored in the memory are extracted from senders' e-mail addresses from incoming e-mail communications [Glenn DNS, col 1 lines 22-30].

36. As per claim 4, Bliss-Glenn disclose receiving a corrected e-mail address from the user in response to the prompt; and repeating the steps of checking a corrected domain name and generating a prompt if the corrected domain name is not included in the list of domain names, until the user either confirms that the domain name provided in the e-mail address is correct or provides a domain name that is in the list of domain names [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

37. As per claim 5, Bliss-Glenn disclose the outgoing e-mail communication is intercepted in an e-mail server to check the domain name in the e-mail address prior to transmission [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

38. As per claim 6, Bliss-Glenn disclose the prompt is an e-mail message from the e-mail server to the user [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

39. As per claim 7, Bliss-Glenn disclose the prompt is a network message to the user [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

40. As per claim 22, Bliss-Glenn disclose the e-mail addresses in the list of e-mail addresses stored in the memory are senders' e-mail addresses extracted from incoming e-mail communications [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

41. As per claim 23, Bliss-Glenn disclose storing tally information (i.e.: frequency tally tracks how often a user received email from a certain address) in the memory to tally the frequency by which the e-mail addresses are extracted from incoming e-mail communications [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

42. As per claim 24, Bliss-Glenn disclose deleting e-mail addresses from the memory that are not frequently extracted from incoming e-mail communications according to respective tally information as inherent feature of a list of address [Bliss, other list of address, col 6 lines 22-30].

43. As per claim 25, Bliss-Glenn disclose the memory is in an e-mail address directory in a client computer system [Bliss, other list of address, col 6 lines 22-30].

44. As per claim 27, Bliss-Glenn disclose the memory is included in an e-mail address directory [Bliss, other list of address, col 6 lines 22-30].

45. As per claim 28, Bliss-Glenn disclose the e-mail address directory additionally stores user-specified e-mail addresses [Bliss, other list of address, col 6 lines 22-30].

46. As per claim 8, Bliss-Glenn disclose a method of automatically checking for misspelled e-mail addresses in out going e-mail communications prior to transmission by an e-mail communications server

extracting domain names in senders' e-mail address from e-mail communications incoming to the email communications server;

storing extracted domain names in a domain name database;

receiving outgoing email communications from a client computer connected to the email communication server through a local network;

searching the domain name database for domain names spelled similarly to the domain name in email address associated with the intend recipient of the out going e-mail communication provided in the outgoing email communications [Melet, indicating a second revolution should be displayed again to user modified, col 11 lines 57-67]; and

generating an error prompt upon detecting that a domain name in an email address provided in an outgoing email communication is misspelled.

47. Claim 18 contains the similar limitations set forth of apparatus claim 8. Therefore, claims 18 is rejected for the similar rationale set forth in claim 8.

Art Unit: 2142

48. As per claim 9, Bliss-Glenn disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by checking each alpha numeric character comprised in the extracted domain name with the alpha-numeric characters comprised in the domain names in the database, and detecting when there is at least one but no more than a maximum number of discrepancies between a domain name in the domain name database and the extracted domain name [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

49. As per claim 10, Bliss-Glenn disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by removing an alpha numeric character from the extracted domain name and searching the domain name database for a domain name consisting of at least each of the remaining alpha numeric characters in the extracted domain name [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

50. As per claim 11, Bliss-Glenn disclose searching for similarly spelled domain names is performed by comparing the extracted domain name with reference domain names stored in the domain name database according to predetermined spelling grammar algorithms [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

Art Unit: 2142

51. As per claim 12, Bliss-Glenn disclose the error prompt is an e-mail message from the e-mail server to the client computer transmitting the e-mail communication [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

52. As per claim 13, Bliss-Glenn disclose the error prompt is a network message from the e-mail server to the client computer transmitting the e-mail communication [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

53. As per claim 14, Bliss-Glenn disclose determining whether extracted domain names are already stored in the domain name database, whereby only a single copy of an extracted domain name is stored in the domain name database.

54. As per claim 15, Bliss-Glenn disclose storing tally information in the domain name database to tally the frequency in which domain names in the domain name database are extracted from incoming e-mail communications [Bliss, a list of misspelling domain name, notified, prompt, col 5 lines 24-39].

55. As per claim 16, Bliss-Glenn disclose deleting domain names from the domain name database that are not frequently extracted from incoming e-mail communications according to respective tally information [Bliss, confirm, review, updat email address and database, col 7 lines 37-60].

56. As per claim 17, Bliss-Glenn disclose the tally information for each domain name in the domain name database includes the calendar date in which the domain name was most recently extracted [Bliss, searching process and compare, col 8 lines 55-61].

57. As per claim 19, Bliss-Glenn disclose (d) an internal network communications interface for receiving outgoing e mail communications to be transmitted from client computers and sending incoming e-mail communications to client computers, wherein the e-mail checker generates an error prompt when detecting a misspelled domain name, which is transmitted from the internal network (i.e.:LAN) communications interface to the client computer requesting transmission of the corresponding outgoing e-mail communication [Bliss, confirm, review, updat email address and database, col 7 lines 37-60].

58. As per claim 20, Bliss-Glenn disclose (e) an external network communications interface for receiving incoming e-mail communications from an external network and sending outgoing e-mail communications transmitted from client computer connected to the internal network, wherein outgoing e-mail communications are transmitted from the external network communications interface to the external network (i.e.: Internet) after the checker confirms e-mail address spelling in the outgoing e-mail communications [Bliss, confirm, review, updat email address and database, col 7 lines 37-60].

Art Unit: 2142

59. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to examiner *Thong Vu*, whose telephone number is (703)-305-4643.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:00AM- 4:30PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, *Jack Harvey*, can be reached at (703) 305-9705.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-9700.

Any response to this action should be mailed to: Commissioner of Patent and Trademarks, Washington, D.C. 20231 or faxed to :

After Final (703) 746-7238

Official: (703) 746-7239

Non-Official (703) 746-7240

Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park 11,2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington. VA., Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Thong Vu
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2142

